

AGENDA

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE

December 14, 2004

7:00 - 10:00 p.m.

Government Center, Room 4/5

<u>Time</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Responsible Person</u>
7:03	Opening/Welcome	Chairman
7:05	Approval of Minutes of November 30	Members
7:10	Announcements/Updates	Members
7:25	Complete Operations Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NEGATIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations• POSITIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations• NEGATIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations• What should the Task Force recommendation be?	Members and Facilitator
8:30	Break	
8:40	Complete Operations Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the issues about the County's PROCUREMENT PROCESS regarding solid waste services?• Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation concerning the County PROCUREMENT PROCESS? Why or why not?• What should the Task Force recommendation be?	Members and Facilitator
9:35	Collectors' Meeting on January 6	John Hasle and Conrad Mehan
9:45	Summary of Meeting	Chairman and/Facilitator
10:00	Adjourn	Chairman

Next meeting – January 25, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Government Center, Room 4/5

Minutes
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE
December 14, 2004, 7:00 - 10:00 p.m.
Government Center, Room 232

Attendees: Marilyn Blois, Jim Langemeier, Joyce Doughty, Joyce Bissonette, Bill Lecos, Joan Carr, Paul Liberty, Conrad Mehan, John Hasle, Joann McCoy

Members Absent : Queenie Cox, Phil Auld (replacement for Peter Crane), Robin Smyers, Sheila Roit, John Townes (resigned), Clark Tyler

Staff: Marilyn McHugh, Jeff Smithberger, Pamela Gratton, and Linda Boone

LMI: Dan Jackson (LMI Government Consulting)

Facilitator: J.R. Holt and Taylor Wells (JRH Associates, Inc.)

Guests: Pat Sanborn, Larry Edwards, Deborah Wisoff, Richard Galliher, Ishmael Wright, and James Patteson

The Chairman, Bill Lecos, called the meeting to order at 7:08, when a quorum was present. The December minutes were approved as presented with the correction to the spelling of Catherine Lunsford's name. The Chairman turned the meeting to J.R. Holt, the facilitator, who had brought GroupSystems software on laptops to the meeting.

J.R. presented an overview of using GroupSystems software on the laptops. Then she reviewed the work from the last meeting concerning the positive and negative consequences of the county ending its residential waste collection operations. The report of the items that were entered in the software is attached to these minutes as the Solid Waste Task Force Report of December 14, 2004. Significant discussion items are presented below.

Operations Issues

Discussion. Additional discussion followed concerning other positive and negative consequences of the county getting out of solid waste collection operations.

Positive consequences to residents

- Residents could control their budget.
- Residents in sanitary districts would have a choice of service provider.

Negative consequences to residents

- Members revisited and agreed to the comments during the November 30 meeting such as one less service provider and loss of special services offered by county.

Positive consequence to haulers

- Members revisited and agreed to the comments made on November 30 such as potentially more customers and loss of a competitor.
- New collection companies might be attracted to the market if there were less potential for business to be lost through a sanitary district process.
- Current collection companies could be retained as they would see less potential for their business to be lost through a sanitary district process.

Negative consequences to haulers

- A collector suggested that with the county out of the collection business but still regulating the industry, they may lose operational perspective and potentially over-regulate. There is a difference when government is involved in an industry being

regulated and when they are not involved. After a period of time, the regulatory body may no longer have an operational perspective on collection issues.

- The collectors, in general, saw no negative consequences to the county ending its collection operations.
- A non-collector raised the issue of whether private collectors have the ability to pick up an additional 40,000 homes while sustaining good customer service.
- Maintaining the balance of competition among the large and small haulers may be a concern.

Positive consequences to the county

- Fairfax County would realize an increased tax base because of Business Professional Occupational License and property taxes from new businesses.
- The county could redefine its role for emergency waste coordination, enforcement, facility improvements and consumer education.
- The county could concentrate on improved regulatory activities, and contract administration provided adequate General Fund support is forthcoming. A member pointed out that since revenue from solid waste collection is not fungible for other solid waste services, some of these savings may not be realized.

Negative consequences to county

- If the county ends its collection operations, there is the potential for up to 130 county employees to lose jobs.
- Once staff and equipment are gone, the county could not react rapidly to emergency situations requiring waste removal using their own equipment.
- Also a consequence would be to limit the collection alternatives offered to dissatisfied customers—there would be no county service.

The Chairman cautioned that the county's ability to provide emergency services is a major issue for the report, so before determining the recommendation for this issue, the Task Force needs to take a holistic view of its recommendations to the Board. Members may need to compromise on certain items to achieve an overall satisfactory report.

Recommendation. The Task Force wants to make a recommendation about the county's role in residential waste collection operations, but is unsure what the recommendation should be. There were lots of comments about a potential recommendation(s). The comments centered around 5 models for future residential waste collection:

- Maintain the status quo
- Maintain sanitary districts but contract the services
- Completely privatize the marketplace with the county getting out of operations
- In sanitary districts, privatize the sanitary district but have the county continue brush collection/yard waste collection
- Maintain sanitary districts without increasing the number of districts or sizes.

This is a summation of the issue to date. Rather than decide tonight, the members agreed to develop the language of the final recommendation later. This matter was put in the Parking Lot.

Procurement of County Contracts Process

Discussion. A question was raised about whether one of the comments had Dillon rule implications. The Dillon Rule restricts the county's powers to only those things that the General Assembly allows.

Some members thought the existing county procurement process may disadvantage some haulers. However, it was pointed out that the same process is used countywide for all contracts and that small business and minority owned business "set-asides" are not allowed in VA.

The idea about carving up the sanitary districts into smaller areas that could be individually bid was discussed. To this county staff explained that because of the sanitary district process, the county has little time to arrange for services once a sanitary district is approved by the Board of Supervisors. For example, the latest district was approved in October for services to begin in January, 2005. There is not sufficient time to competitively solicit each sanitary district and the cost of preparing a separate solicitation for each district will be expensive.

One member asked if the Task Force could develop a threshold for deciding what number of new customers would require a new collection solicitation to be issues, for example 200 customers.

Recommendation. This issue was moved to the Parking Lot and will be addressed in conjunction with the issue of the county's role in residential waste collection.

Input on Report

Clark Tyler, Paul Liberty, Conrad Mehan and Joann McCoy volunteered to work with staff on drafting the report. The work group will have a draft of the Environmental issues to the members about 10 days prior to the next meeting. The subcommittee's first meeting will be on January 11, 2005. The Chairman requested that members study the draft before the next meeting and come prepared with changes they feel are essential to the final document. The next three meetings of the Task Force will deal with draft chapters about the environmental, customer service and operations issues discussed to date.

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Next meeting – January 25, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Government Center Room 4/5

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT FROM DECEMBER 14TH MEETING

Tuesday, December 14, 2004

Agenda - SWMTF - Agenda for Dec 14th Meeting	3
ROLES AND GROUND RULES	4
MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE	4
PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!	4
FACILITATION TEAM	4
GROUND RULES	4
CONSENSUS	5
SIGN-IN	5
OPERATIONAL ISSUES	6
CONSEQUENCE OF THE COUNTY GETTING OUT OF DIRECT WASTE REMOVAL	6
PROCUREMENT OF COUNTY CONTRACTS	14

Agenda - SWMTF - Agenda for Dec 14th Meeting

12/14/2004

7:00 PM WELCOME BACK ON DECEMBER 14TH

William Lecos, Chairman
JR Holt, Group Facilitator
Linda Boone, Fairfax County
Dan Jackson & Colin Waitt, LMI

7:05 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES

GDS facilitator discusses collaborative technology environment & roles of participants, Chairman, facilitation team.

7:10 PM OPERATIONAL ISSUES

Discuss and final make decisions on the Operational issues.

8:30 PM BREAK

8:45 PM PROCUREMENT OF COUNTY CONTRACTS

Continue discussions and make final decision

9:05 PM FINAL REPORT

Review the timeline
Discuss the mechanics of writing and reviewing the report
Other items.....

10:00 PM ADJOURN MEETING

ROLES AND GROUND RULES

MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

1. PURPOSE:

-- Use collaborative technology to finish the last two Operational issues.

2. SCOPE:

-- Two Operational issues

3. MEETING OBJECTIVE:

-- Complete discussion and make decisions about Operational and other issues

4. SESSION OUTPUT (edited) will be disseminated as basis of meeting minutes.

PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!

1. CHAIRMAN

-- Participate as Task Force member

-- Officiate over voting results

-- Oversee meeting

2. Responsible for CONTENT

3. PARTICIPATE actively

4. REPRESENT your IDEAS and your constituents' perspectives as appropriate

5. YOU JOINTLY OWN THE PRODUCT OF THE MEETING!

FACILITATION TEAM

1. Responsible for the PROCESS of the meeting (FACILITATES)

2. Ensures EQUAL PARTICIPATION

3. Deals with GROUP DYNAMICS

4. Maintains meeting PACE

5. Ensures COMPLETION of ACTIVITIES

6. Is the INTERFACE between the participants and the technology.

7. STARTS and **STOPS** participants in the software

8. CONTROLS the SOFTWARE, gives and takes away participant privileges

9. Provides all TECHNICAL SUPPORT (hardware, software, network)

GROUND RULES

1. WE ARE GOING TO CONTINUE TO MOVE VERY FAST!

2. USE THE TECHNOLOGY to record and/or capture ideas/opinions before we have verbal discussions

3. The meeting is "NON-ATTRIBUTION / NON-RETRIBUTION"

4. Be COURTEOUS

5. Do not INTERRUPT

6. Stay FOCUSED on the Task Force interests.

7. Look beyond the "BOTTOM LINE" to make sure we are achieving what the majority of Task Force members have chosen.
8. Keep MOVING FORWARD -- Don't wait for the 100% solution.
9. Don't get your feelings HURT.
10. Appointed Task Force MEMBERS will input information into the computers anonymously. Other attendees will have their ideas attributed.
11. If we can't come to consensus at this meeting, we will use the "PARKING LOT" -- but very sparingly.

CONSENSUS

1. Everyone has INPUT
2. Have a GENERAL UNDERSTANDING of ideas and discussions
3. Select the group's PREFERRED course of action
4. Usually NOT unanimous or complete agreement

SIGN-IN

1. Double click here to sign-in with your name

John Hasle {#179}
jim langemeier {#180}
Joyce Doughty {#181}
Marilyn Blois {#182}
Joan Carr {#183}
Paul Liberty {#184}
Marilyn McHugh {#185}
Pat Sanborn {#186}
Linda Boone {#187}
JoAnn McCoy {#188}
Jeffrey Smithberger {#189}
Dan Jackson {#190}
Joyce Bissonette {#191}
Rick Galliher {#192}
conrad mehan {#193}
Larry Edwards
Bill Lecos {#194}
Deborah Wisoff
Ishmael Wright
Pamela Gratton
James Patteson

OPERATIONAL ISSUES

CONSEQUENCE OF THE COUNTY GETTING OUT OF DIRECT WASTE REMOVAL

1. The County currently collects waste and special collections from about 43,000 homes in sanitary districts. This is about 15% of the homes in the County and of these approximately 1,600 are served by contract. The County provides vacuum leaf collection for approximately 22,000 customers. Supervisor Kaufmann asked that the consequences of the County getting out of direct waste collections be evaluated.

2. What are the POSITIVE consequences to RESIDENTS of the County ending its waste collection operations?

More money in the pockets of the county and/or private haulers. {#1073}

Opens to free market. {#1074}

None {#1076}

none {#1077}

none {#1079}

Residents have CHOICE in selecting hauling services. {#1083}

Re: 1083. Residents in the sanitary districts have exercised a choice when they petitioned for the County to take over collection service. {#1114, County Staff}

More choice of service types, service days, frequencies and if service is not good the ability to change providers. {#1088}

No positive consequences. Residents who don't have County services are not impacted either way, and residents that have service have asked for it and therefore it is not a positive to take that option away. {#1094}

Ref #1094--That's not necessarily true. Many homeowners who requested county service 30-40-50 years ago are long gone and newer residents "inherited" county service when they bought their homes. {#1149}

1149 And are very happy with one stop service - all services they could want from one provider at one low price. {#1163}

If the county is operating as "the collector of last resort" (as I think it is), then the key question is whether the current roster of 30 private haulers are capable of providing the service and the coverage. {#1097}

County provides good service so there will be no service benefit to the resident.

But, sooner or later the County will have to not subsidize the wide range of services it provides to these residents; by privatizing, the County can

1. Scale back the current level of service so as to keep the resident from experiencing a rate increase, or

2 County can, through the private hauler's contract rate, charge the appropriate costs for the current cornucopia of services {#1106}

For residents currently being serviced by the County--None--as long as the same level or better service is provided and the transfer is "seamless" to the residents. {#1110}

Don't know if there are any positives. Does the County subsidize the service costs in any way to the residents who use this service? As a resident of the County who contracts with a private hauler, do I have any incentive to use the County? Or is the service provided due to lack of private service availability in a particular area? {#1117}

Note to #1117 - Service is available by private haulers in all areas of the County. The county originally established sanitary districts when there were no private haulers available. {#1160}

Re 1117 The County General Fund does not subsidize the collection service. {#1180}

the "positive" impact would only be manifest if haulers were given distinct routes or territories. {#1119}

For 85% of the residents it would not have a direct impact except that potential savings to the county budget could be used to improve other solid waste services that benefit all -- such as improvements to county facilities, improved recycling efficiencies, better enforcement of existing regulation. County customers would have the opportunity to see an increased level of service from the one day per week pickup they currently have. {#1120}

If the County were to discontinue collection of solid waste that would mean eliminating one of the choices of haulers available to citizens-- thus lessening choice. {#1121, Other Attendee}

Residents will have additional choice in selecting trash service. The county can provide service in areas that are not adequately served by the private sector. Additionally, in the case of emergencies, the county should have some refuse removal and transportation capabilities for the quick response to emergency situations. {#1133, Other Attendee}

The folks who have their waste picked up by the County must make the effort to contract for this service, therefore, there is no positive consequence to the residents who are being serviced by the County. Overall, there will be little impact either way, to the 1mill+ residents if the County ends waste collection {#1144}

None {#1146}

response to 1120 - the need twice per week refuse collection is reduced by adding additional recyclables to be collected at the curb. This results in less refuse being collected and ultimately disposed of which in turn reduces the tip fees paid by the hauler. Additionally, revenue is generated from the sale of recyclables, a portion of which is paid to the haulers.

Increased recycling also provides opportunities for less frequent collection of recyclables (perhaps once every two weeks) thereby providing opportunities for haulers to be creative in devising collection strategies that make them more competitive in the market. {#1175, Other Attendee}

Note #1160 - Private haulers may serve all areas of the County, but residents are not always satisfied with the one or two haulers available to them. {#1186}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

-- Residents currently served by the County would have a choice of service provider -- including twice a week collection.

-- Remove direct service from County budgetary process {#1192, FACILITATOR}

Residents will have the opportunity to control their budget, a significant factor to homeowner associations, civic associations, and property management firms. Residents will also have the opportunity to customize their waste services to the needs of their individual communities. {#1210}

Residents will not have an additional line item on their real estate taxes. {#1212}

3. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to RESIDENTS of the County ending its waste collection operations?

Opens to free market. {#1075}

Takes away one more hauler for them to select {#1078}

More man hours on the routes for the county and/or private haulers {#1080}

RE: 1080. Please explain comment. {#1173, County Staff}

one less choice for the consumers {#1086}

Having to find a new hauler; possible different service provided by new hauler; unable to pay for service via tax bill. {#1087}

none {#1095}

They would have fewer items they could recycle curbside and they would be charged extra for that and for special pickups of brush and bulk. They would have to manually transport them to a recycling center to save money. {#1098}

Residents having County service may have to pay more for private hauler service.

Would have to pay more frequently than annual payment to County {#1099}

It is likely the resident will have to pay the true cost of the service and/or accept a lower level of service, specifically, no more unlimited

A. leaf service

B. brush service

C..bulky waste service {#1122}

Don't know. Would it cost more for a customer to find a private hauler? {#1131}

Eliminating County collection negatively affects the residents that have asked for that service (and pay for it) because they were unsatisfied with the service quality or level that was otherwise available to them.

Eliminating the County collection option for those not currently receiving it simply removes an alternative to other residents that are unsatisfied with private collection. {#1136}

putting leaf collection to one side, the main negative is the lack of availability of qualified private haulers from which to choose. {#1137}

Potential loss of service and direct contact to address complaints and/or concerns if contracted hauler is not up to par as service previously provided by the County. {#1139}

Higher costs for county customers when they contract with a private hauler. Elimination of free special pick up services. More work to provide leaves in bags as opposed to curb side vacuum pick up. For residents served currently by private haulers there would be no affect. {#1142}

Overall, there will be little impact either way to the majority of County residents, but those who have chosen the County will have a negative impact with the removal of their hauler. {#1153}

how does the county justify the lower than average cost to the 43,000 residents for the services provided and not provide this rate for all residents? {#1177}

Residents have less choice and there is no fail-safe mechanism for communities and areas that cannot obtain collection service from private haulers.

It would be very hard for any or all of the private haulers to be able to instantaneously absorb the county's customers should service be curtailed. This would create temporary, but difficult, disruptions in collection service.

The service level provided sanitary districts might not be able to be duplicated by the private sector, especially curbside vacuum leaf collection. {#1187, Other Attendee}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

- One less service provider
- Lose their selected service provider for those residents who have petitioned to be in a sanitary district
- The County currently offers more services for a flat fee
- Perception of the residents that haulers don't provide services the County did
- Loss of special services (leaf collection, special collections, bulk pick-up) {#1196, FACILITATOR}

4. What are the POSITIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations?

More customers for them to pick up. {#1081}

ditto #1081 {#1093}

43,000 potential new customers. {#1082}

There are none. Since most of the County's collection is through private haulers. {#1085}

Increased business. {#1096}

Allows for more density reducing costs. {#1103}

They could pick up a bit more business, but it would most likely have to be on a contract basis. {#1107}

Haulers would have one source of competition eliminated

Could pick up additional customers. {#1108}

It offers the haulers more market opportunities {#1130}

Haulers will compete for these added customers. {#1141}

More potential customers for all haulers. Could be good for competition. Potential better service to the customer. {#1143}

\$\$\$\$\$\$ and opportunity to demonstrate quality service when compared to its competitors. {#1148}

The potential for more customers. The density in the older communities may make for more efficient routing and collections. {#1152}

Some new competitors may see it as an opportunity to enter the market. They now see the potential for their business to be taken away at any time. {#1182}

Potential for increased customer base and possibly more efficiency for the hauler. {#1159}

If the county's role is confined to special pick-ups, emergencies, leaf & brush collection, then the haulers would be left to do what they do best. {#1172}

More business to privately owned companies; few benefits to customers. {#1189, Other Attendee}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

-- More customers

-- Better revenue stream

-- Lose a competitor

-- Present County market is more densely populated which makes collection more efficient

-- Attract new businesses to the market as they see less potential for having their business taken away through the sanitary district process

-- Retain current businesses as they also see less potential for having their customers and business taken through the sanitary district process. {#1197, FACILITATOR}

Level playing field with the county out of the waste business. {#1213}

5. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations?

More customers to pick up if they do not have the trucks/staff to do so. {#1084}

The county would be regulating an industry it has no direct involvement in. {#1091}

There are none. Since most of the county's collection is through private haulers. {#1092}

none {#1101}

The county will free resources to insure enforcement of code {#1109}

Re: 1109. Is this a negative consequence from the hauler's perspective? {#1185, County Staff}

None {#1113}

If the transition happens before the haulers can handle the additional work load, you will have unhappy new customers. {#1118}

They will have to fill in with more services that sanitary district residents are already getting. This means more trucks and more costs that may not be recoverable as the rates may not be comparable. {#1124}

We will no longer be able to 'complain about the County service'. {#1138}

None. {#1145}

Haulers may not have capacity to absorb 40,000 new customers. {#1151}

Possibility of not being adequately prepared to service additional customers--otherwise, no negative consequences. {#1158}

A fifteen percent shift is likely to be immaterial to the haulers. Small haulers would need time to prepare for competition for the new customers. {#1161}

With the tight labor market for blue collar workers, haulers may not have the staff to pick up additional clients. {#1164}

presumably, the large haulers would benefit most - especially if some areas are just not able to be served by small haulers. Then the negative would be to put the squeeze on the small hauler. {#1179}

1179 Unless the large haulers contracted with the small ones to fill in the gaps. {#1190}

No assistance in times of emergencies. {#1191, Other Attendee}

none {#1214}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

-- The hauler community sees no negative consequences

-- Regulatory body will no longer have an operational perspective to hauler issues

-- Question (from non-haulers) about the ability of the haulers to pick up an additional 40K homes (while sustaining good customer service)

-- Maintaining the balance of competition among the large & small haulers {#1215, FACILITATOR}

6. What are the POSITIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations?

No more picking up trash!! {#1089}

Larger customer base in the hands of private haulers resulting in more revenue. {#1102}

Reduced staff, equipment and long term obligations. {#1104}

more money for other programs within the county {#1111}

Money saved on trucks and personnel related costs. {#1123}

County could eliminate cost of providing benefits to solid waste staff.. Certainly would be cost saving, though county service is supposed to be self-supporting. {#1125}

Allow for staff to perform other functions. reduce complaints about county provided service. No collection costs or problems. Reduction of county work force. {#1127}

No vehicle maintenance; less employee cost. {#1129}

County could concentrate on enforcement, avoid growing problems with the shortage in the labor market, and perhaps concentrate on ancillary services such as leaf or brush collection. {#1147}

More resources, i.e. staff, \$\$\$, and time to focus on different issues, and not just with waste collection. {#1154}

No positives from a service perspective. County would reduce staff, but general fund would not save any money since the customers pay for the service. {#1157}

Ability to re-direct resources to other critical areas that may ensure a successful unified recycling program. {#1165}

Frees resources for the enhanced provision of the other solid waste services that the county would retain responsibility for -- such as emergency waste removal capacity, enforcement, facility improvements, and consumer education. Or, the county could expend services that the private haulers don't provide such as curb side leaf vacuuming which would have beneficial environment impacts. {#1168}

One time cost savings by getting rid of trucks, etc. {#1169}

the county could have its role re-defined as an emergency hauler, limited to special pick-ups, leaf collection, brush collection and other tasks the haulers either do not do well or don't want to do (or are not equipped to do). {#1170}

Reduce risk and exposure to liability issues. {#1216}

Less government control. {#1217}

county could set up a customer service call center with the money saved for all haulers {#1218}

Less county over spending (FAT). {#1219}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

-- Increased tax base from BPOL and property tax

-- The county could re-define its role as emergency waste coordination, enforcement, facility improvements, consumer education and unified recycling.

-- The County could concentrate on improved regulatory activities, contract administration, and coordination of emergency activities provided adequate support from the General Fund is forthcoming

-- Revenue from solid waste collection is not fungible for other solid waste management services. {#1221, FACILITATOR}

7. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations?

None {#1090}

May result in no enforcement of rules protecting the consumer and no order of trash collection. {#1112}
none {#1115}

Once the staff and equipment are gone they will never be replaced. If an occasion arose such as a "disaster" they would not be in a position to participate and would have to rely on the private sector for all services. {#1126}

None {#1128}

None {#1132}

Lost jobs. Even if workers are picked up by a hauler, benefit package may not be the same. {#1135}

Loss of jobs for collectors; calls from current customers upset over loss of some services or having to pay higher prices for same services they are getting now. {#1140}

the biggest negative is on the hundred or so employees who now have a job, benefits etc. {#1150}

County would lose critical mass of equipment and personnel to deal with emergency situations, especially due to weather related activities. The County is densely populated and debris needs to be removed quickly from roadways, power line areas, etc. {#1155}

Potential lost jobs. Not guaranteed the County could place current staff into other positions nor private companies would be able to pick them up, and at the same salary/benefits they are receiving today. Also, would the cost to the customers be increased? {#1166}

The County would have no alternatives to offer unsatisfied residents.

The County would lose capacity to immediately react with equipment and manpower if a disaster occurs.

The County could end up with problems like last year when a large company got out of the business and another over-extended and couldn't provide good customer service for an extended period of time due to a lack of resources to meet the needs of these added customers. {#1171}

Poor PR with lost jobs and mad residents. {#1174}

If the County does not re-train or place all staff associated with the waste collection operations it may be viewed as an outsourcing czar. The little man will be most affected if the County does not do more to ensure those folks are retained. {#1178}

I'm not sure {#1183}

Citizens who like service might be upset that the govt is no longer meeting their needs, especially if they sought out the district. {#1220}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

-- Potential for employee displacement (130 employees)

-- Once the staff and equipment are gone they will never be replaced. If an occasion arose such as a "disaster" they would not be in a position to participate and would have to rely on the private sector for all services.

-- Fewer alternatives for County to provide service to sanitary districts {#1222, FACILITATOR}

8. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation on whether the County should continue to collect solid waste, special collections and vacuum leaves? Why or why not?

I would love for the county to vacuum all homeowners leaves. Since the plastic bags make recycling/mulching leaves impossible, this might be a good solution. {#1105}

Yes. Private haulers cannot pick up all residents, municipalities, etc. {#1116}

yes, they should continue to collect so if the customer service situation continues to degrade the residents will have an option. {#1156}

Yes, County could privatize the trash collection and keep the brush and leaf collection.

This would allow the County to keep the critical mass it needs for emergency situations. {#1162}

Yes. The County should consider changing its current focus. Leaf and brush pickup should be a service provided by the County. Let the end customer determine who to use for regular trash and recycling services. {#1176}

Yes...residents who will be most affected should be aware of the Task Force's recommendation and reasons for the recommendation...good buy in {#1184}

Yes, maintain status quo. {#1188}

The county collects refuse and recyclables as a service to county residents. The county would be severely limited in its ability to respond to any refuse issue and would be criticized if it did not have the ability.

The county's collection service provides a baseline service level and associated fees that can be used to measure the quality and value of service provided by private haulers.

The county should retain its ability to provide service to residents when requested by residents. {#1194, Other Attendee}

The govt should not be in the business of hauling any type of waste. {#1211}

The County should continue in the solid waste collection arena, it has minimal impact on the industry, but has numerous potential benefits. {#1223}

I agree with 1156, 1194, 1223: the County remaining in the business has positives. Also, as 1176 says, let the customers choose -- and they chose the County. {#1229}

9. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

The task force should recommend a workable and meaningful enforcement strategy that will incentivize all haulers (including the county) to perform to county requirements. {#1195, Other Attendee}

Private haulers large, medium or small, should have the opportunity to bid on government contracting, local or state. {#1134}

Re: 1134, all haulers can bid on County contracts. {#1235}

Please clarify 1167. It says (B) continue w/brush and leaf and (C) consider suspending vacuum leaf collection and brush. (?????) {#1240, County Staff}

Yes, the County should:

A. Privatize trash collection

B. Continue with brush and leaf collection

C. Consider suspending vacuum leaf collection and brush collection. {#1167}

Re: 1167. Please clarify (C) "consider suspending . . ." {#1226, County Staff}

Agree with 1167. County will maintain control. Haulers will have more opportunity for new business. County would exit the vacuum leaf business which is very expensive. Residents would avoid the eventual rate increase County would have to impose to cover the full cost of the current service. County would maintain the brush service which employs the equipment needed for storm related emergencies. {#1227}

Regarding 1227, this assumes County maintains the sanitary districts but privatizes. {#1233}

Re:1167 Why should the County suspend vacuum leaf collection when customers want that service and pay extra for that specific service? {#1238}

Yes. The County should continue to support private trash collection and incent haulers to perform.

Brush and leaf collection should be mandatory and provided by the County. {#1181}

Please clarify #1181 "incent haulers to perform" {#1230, County Staff}

Ref #1181 Leaf collection is a service that is very costly and not utilized by a majority of county residents (voters). A different approach to this service needs to be developed. {#1234}

County should maintain existing operations (i.e. county owned equipment and county employees) without expansion. {#1193}

County should maintain existing operations, including landfill/ transfer station/ incinerator and collection staff and trucks without expansion. {#1224}

Government should not be in the business of hauling trash. Their role is to be the regulatory body, just as they are for other private services in the county, not competing in the business marketplace. {#1225}

County should begin a process of privatization of trash collection to be completed over a period of 5-10 years. Could be done by ceasing new sanitary districts and dismantling existing ones on a graduated basis. {#1228}

The county should not be in the waste collection business, and should focus their energies on regulatory, contracting and emergencies preparedness. We do not need to grow government. Further, it sets the stage for other county agencies to move into other areas that are currently being serviced by private industry which may jeopardize free enterprise., and further eradicate small and minority businesses. {#1231}

The task force should recommend continuation of County sanitary districts. The impact on the industry is minimal and the benefits have been identified . {#1232}

Private haulers should have the ability to compete w/County when a community asks to create a sanitary district. County should be considered as only one more vendor doing business in the County.

All haulers, private and County, must perform at a higher level of customer satisfaction (i.e., time to get trash cans to customers, return calls, pick up missed service, etc.) Let the market rule. {#1236}

The County should stop their collection of solid waste, but maintain contractual control over sanitary districts through the use of private haulers. The County should also upgrade the Code to clarify minimum standards, and enforce them so that the need for sanitary districts disappears. {#1237, Other Attendee}

The county should continue to sustain operational capacity as it provides critical capacity for emergency needs. The county should expand its capacity for leaf pick up as it is more efficient in diverting the material from the landfill and increases the recycling ratio within the solid waste stream. If the county continues to compete with private haulers through the sanitary district process then alternatives should be found to allow individual subscribers within those districts to opt out of county service to meet different service expectations without the penalty of paying for services not desired or utilized. {#1239}

Ref#1193, 1224 this looks like a good idea, maintaining the current sanitary districts. However, I see the haulers asking the County to provide the most expensive services. This could still result in more cost to residents. Unified services are important.

#1237 is a good thought. {#1241}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

Recommendations:

- Status Quo
- Maintain sanitary district (contract out services)
- Get out of marketplace all together
- In sanitary districts, privatize trash collection / continue yard waste as at present
- Maintain sanitary districts without increasing numbers or sizes {#1249, FACILITATOR}

PROCUREMENT OF COUNTY CONTRACTS

1. The County's procurement system is established under authority from the State. State and County procurement rules and procedures allow for additional service areas to be added to a contract by mutual agreement without recompeting. It is the County's policy to use the existing contract instead of developing a new contract for each new sanitary district that is added. This process saves on solicitation costs (estimated to exceed \$30,000 per solicitation in terms of staff and contractors' time) and additional work throughout the County's procurement system. Procurement law does not constrain the number of awards that can be won by a single company.

2. What are the issues about the County's PROCUREMENT PROCESS regarding solid waste services?

What do the haulers say, since the rest of us don't participate in the procurement process? {#1242}

I don't know. Out of my area of expertise. {#1243}

It eliminates is a fair process for all haulers to compete. {#1244}

Being neither a county employee or private hauler, unfortunately I do not know. {#1245}

The County's procurement process for solid waste is the same as that completed for every other facet of County contracting. {#1246, County Staff}

Market domination by a large company able to bid at an unrealistic price in order to grab market share. {#1247}

Is this a Dillon Rule issue? {#1248}

Re 1248: Dillon Rule issue: Rules which restrict the County to only those things which are specifically granted by the General Assembly. {#1252, FACILITATOR}

No problems. County just recently began privatization which should be viewed positively by haulers. {#1250}

As the procurement process is set as a matter of law and county-wide policy I don't think there are issue which can be isolated as only affecting solid waste collection. {#1251}

The county follows the contracting procedures that are implemented by the Department of Purchasing and Supply Management and as such has little control over the actual contracting process. the Department of Purchasing and Supply Management controls how services are procured, not the solid waste program.

The county has contracted for collection of recyclables since the implementation of the curbside collection program in 1990. It has recently issued a collection contract for refuse according to county purchasing regulations. Therefore, the county has a history of contracting collection services with private sector. {#1253, County Staff}

DISCUSSION POINTS:

- The existing process may unfairly disadvantage haulers that may be interested
- This is more of a county wide process problem -- not just solid waste collection
- "Rolling over" contracts is a standard in contracting both in the county and other entities
- Approval of a sanitary district and implementation of that district does not always allow for enough time for a full competitive bid process
- Other considerations come into play when contracting a new sanitary district: location, nearness to other contractors, etc. {#1254, FACILITATOR}

3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation concerning the County PROCUREMENT PROCESS? Why or why not?

The task force should develop a framework for expanding competition for contracts without creating unnecessary expense for the county -- as it applies to solid waste collections in sanitary district. {#1255}

Not yet. I would like to hear from Marilyn on the legal issues affecting this issue. {#1256}

No, don't have enough information. {#1257}

Ditto #1257. {#1258}

DISCUSSION:

Table this issue until a recommendation is made on sanitary districts and the role of County in solid waste collection. {#1259, FACILITATOR}

RE:1255 - the task force may make a recommendation concerning competition, but not should not necessarily develop the framework in this forum. {#1260}

4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?